

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Orlando Acosta & Edward Lloyd, et al., :

CIVIL ACTION NO.

vs.
Democratic City Committee, Emilio
Sagor, Elaine Tomlin, et al., :

2:17-CV-01462
(Hon. Judge Slovinsky)

Answer To Defendants 2nd Requested Motion of Dismissal

Plaintiffs, Orlando Acosta and Edward Lloyd, Pro-Se.

- (1) Plaintiffs 2nd Response To Dismiss case No. 2:17 cv. 01462
Plaintiffs reply To Defendants Motion as follows
- A. Orlando Acosta and Edward Lloyd Answer To Defendants question why did plaintiffs not get remedy through State Court (All evidence will be produced in court)
- (A) Edward Lloyd was a candidate for State Representative placed #No. 1 on The Ballot in The 2014 Election in The 197th District. And he was challenged due to signatures. Mr. Lloyd bought 12-15 voters that were challenged to State Court and proved they were legal registered voters but The Judge still removed Mr. Lloyd stating go bring in 250-300 more in less than 2 hours. Mr. Lloyd believed he wouldn't get remedy in State Court due to previous ruling in State Court. (Be advised Leslie Acosta was opposed)
- (B) Edward Lloyd ran against Leslie Acosta as a write-in candidate for State Representative Seat (re-election) in 2016 when

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Orlando Acosta & Edward Lloyd, et al., :

CIVIL ACTION NO.

vs. Democratic C.D. Committee, Emilio
Sagor, Elaine Tomlin, et al., :

2:17-CV-01462
(Hon. Judge Sloviter)

Answer To Defendant's 2nd Requested Motion of Dismissal

(B) conf. Leslie Acosta was found to have pled guilty to 1 count of Embezzlement, Fraudulent Money Laundering, and Mr. Lloyd received over 50 votes as a write in candidate. The most of all the write in candidates that ran against her. But the Democratic Party still seated her until she officially resigned on January 3rd, 2017 due to her guilty plea. Ed Lloyd should have been declared winner due to having the most votes.

(C) Mr. Lloyd ran again in the Special Election and he reported to the State Department, City Committee, Committee of 70, County Board of Elections, City Commissioners office, Attorney General office, Governor's office, Speaker of the House, and Philadelphia Attorney, as well as Philadelphia Police. And received no help in the Complaint of the Special Election. That's why Edward Lloyd filed with the Federal Court.

(2) Orlando Acosta was a candidate in 2016 General Election as a write in candidate against former State Representative Leslie Acosta, he received (3) Three write in votes. Leslie Acosta should have never been declared State Representative

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Orlando Acosta & Edward Lyle, et al., :

CIVIL ACTION NO.

vs. :
Democratic C.D. Committee, Emilio :
Sorey, Elaine Tomlin, et al., :

2:17-CV-01462
(Hon. Judge Slovinsky)

Answer To Defendants 2nd Requested Motion of Dismissal

2) cont. because under the State Constitution any Individual That is holding public office That has plead or found Guilty of Embezzlement of Public Funds cannot be Eligible To Run for or continue to stay in Public office under the Laws (State) of Pennsylvania. Mr. Orlando Acosta challenged in Commonwealth Court and didn't get Remedy. Then he was the only Write-In Candidate To appeal and Challenge Leslie Acosta ^{didn't} in the General Election To Commonwealth Courts and still get Remedy. Both Courts stated they have no Jurisdiction of the Elections. That's why Orlando Acosta joined in with other Plaintiffs to File A Federal Lawsuit to seek Remedy in regards to 1972 District State Representative seat. Mr. Orlando Acosta contacted The District Attorney, Philadelphia Police Comm. Sec of 70, Department of State, County Board of Elections, speaker of the House, Mike Turzai, Governor Wolf's office, other State Representatives office, and City Commissioners to file complaints NO Remedy.

#4

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Orlando Acosta & Edward Lloyd, et al., :

CIVIL ACTION NO.

vs. :
Democratic C.D. Committee, Emilio :
Sgorey, Elaine Tomlin, et al., :

2:17-CV-01462
(Hon. Judge Slovinsky)

Answer To Defendants 2nd Requested Motion of Dismissal
was given To Mr. Acosta or any other Plaintiffs.

3.) Plaintiffs also have knowledge that the Pennsylvania Attorney General and Philadelphia District Attorney's office is conducting A Criminal Investigation in regards to the Special Election 197th District and has been fully cooperating with the Special Agents sharing Evidence ^{testimony} with them. And this case should NOT be Allowed To be Dismissed due to the Evidence of Fraud, Corruption, Conspiracy that Took place on Tuesday March 21st 2017 and Prior surrounding the 197th District. All Evidence will be provided at the scheduled Court Hearing in September.

Respectfully Submitted,

Orlando Acosta Pro-SE
Orlando Acosta, Pro-SE
Edward Lloyd - Pro-SE
Edward Lloyd Pro-SE